REMARKS

Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bent et al., Publication No.: US 2004/0230911, hereinafter "Bent". Applicant(s) submit that no new matter was introduced in the amendment of the claims. Claims 1, 19 and 33 have been amended, claims 2, 3, 20 and 21 have been cancelled and claims 1, 4-19 and 22-40 remain in prosecution.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bent. Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claim language, as amended claim 1 now recites in part *"the execution priority order being established using a priority indicator associated with each of the plurality of binding statements"*. Support for this amendment can be found for example in paragraph [0017]. In the office action it is mentioned on page 4 that the cited Bent reference teaches "establishing a priority order" in paragraph [0229]. Applicant respectfully disagrees, in paragraph [0229] it simply mentions a Sort that applies a sort order to the <u>data collection</u> not an execution priority order for each of a plurality of binding statements as recited in claim 1. Further, the cited paragraphs [0060], [0064] and [0065] mentioned in the office action also fail to teach or suggest providing a priority indicator associated with each of the plurality of binding statements. For example, in paragraph [0064] of the Bent reference discusses binding to a data collection by updating values associated with a data collection whenever a current record is updated, while paragraph [0065] discusses binding to an XML node. This is much different than establishing the execution priority of the binding statements using a priority indicator associated with each of the plurality of binding statements. Given the above, it is believed that claim 1 is in condition for allowance in view of the cited reference. Dependent claims 4-18 which add further nonobvious limitations to claim 1 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 19 has also been amended as claim 1 above with the addition of the limitation *"the priority order is established using a priority indicator associated with*

each of the plurality of binding statements". So the same arguments previously made with relation to claim 1 apply. Independent claim 19 has also been amended to further recite *"displaying a fallback value in the user interface if both the first and second binding statements fail to evaluate successfully"*, support for this amendment can be found in for example in paragraph [0040]. Claim 20 which has been cancelled and mentioned a "fallback value" was rejected on page 6, item 27 of the office action by stating that "the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 17 presented above...". However, claim 17 does not recite any "fallback value" and in page 5, item 24 in discussing the reason for the rejection of claim 17 it refers to paragraph [0309] of Bent which provides no teaching or suggestion for the "displaying a fallback value in the user interface if both the first and second binding statements fail to evaluate successfully" as currently recited. As such it is believed that independent claim 19 and dependent claims 22-32 are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 33 has been amended to now recite *"displaying a fallback value in the user interface if the collection of binding statements fail to evaluate successfully"*. In view of the comments made above for independent claim 19 for the displaying of a fallback value, it is believed that claim 33 is in condition for allowance in view of the cited Bent reference given that the reference fails to teach of suggest such a limitation. As such, claim 33 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 34-40 which add further nonobvious limitation are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: January 7, 2008   /Kenneth R. Eiferman/
                                                       Kenneth R. Eiferman
                                                       Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439